



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,677	04/19/2007	Robert Gordon Hood	9931-010US	4798
79526	7590	05/18/2012	EXAMINER	
DeMont & Breyer, LLC			TANNER, JOCELIN C	
100 Commons Way, Ste. 250				
Holmdel, NJ 07733			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2012	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[international@dblaw.com](mailto:international@dblaw.com)

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/597,677	HOOD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JOCELIN TANNER	3731	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-3, 17-23, 25 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
  - 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-3, 17-23, 25, and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                                       | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed 23 June 2011. Claims 1-3, 17-23, 25, and 28-30 are currently pending. The Examiner acknowledges the amendments to claims 21-23, 25 and 28-30 and the cancellation of claims 4-16, 24, 26, 27, 31 and 32.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 June 2011 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

6. The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 23 June 2011 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-3, 17-23, 25 and 28-30 based upon 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection citing Houston et al. (2003/0139807) in view of Falotico et al. (7,195,640) and Greenhalgh (6,159,239) as set forth in the last Office action because: though the stent of the present invention provides elution characteristics that are disproportionately better and unexpected as the result of the helical insert, the prior art of record also disclose a helical insert and a drug coating. The objective evidence of nonobviousness has not been shown since the properties of the claimed invention and prior art do not appear to differ to such an extent that the difference is really unexpected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**1. Claims 1-3, 17-23, 25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houston et al. (US PGPub No. 2003/0139807) in view of Falotico et al. (US Patent No. 7,195,640, “Falotico”) in view of Houston (US Patent No. EP 1254645A1).**

2. Regarding claim 1, Houston et al. discloses a wire mesh intravascular stent having a blood-contacting surface on its interior. The stent includes a polyurethane stent insert [0039] having a helical formation on the blood contacting surface (Fig. 1, element #2). The helical formation includes at least one fin (Figs. 3-6) and is capable of inducing helical flow of blood flowing past [0042]. However, Houston et al. fails to disclose a drug releasably associated with the helical formation and the formation having a helix angle between 8° and 20°.

Falotico et al. teaches a coated medical device that may be coated with any number of therapeutic drugs, agents or compounds (column 10, lines 3-5, column 12, lines 53-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the helical stent of Houston et al. with the therapeutic and pharmaceutical drug coating, as taught by Falotico et al., for the

prevention of multiple components of neointimal hyperplasia or restenosis and to reduce inflammation and thrombosis (column 11, lines 10-15).

Houston ('645) teaches a stent (11; Fig. 1) that includes a stent insert (12). The stent insert has a helical formation to induce helical flow [0014]. The helical formation has a helix angle between 5° and 50° which encompasses the claimed range of 8° and 20° [0012-0013, 0036]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the stent insert of the combination of Houston and Falotico with a helical angle between 8° and 20°, as taught by Houston ('645), to provide helical flow inducing means [0013-0014].

3. Regarding claim 2, Falotico et al. teaches a stent or "drug delivery device" formed by the mixing of a polymer and rapamycin, an antibiotic used to treat restenosis, by directly incorporating rapamycin into a polymeric matrix wherein the rapamycin elutes from the polymeric matrix over time into the surrounding tissue (column 14, lines 1-4 and column 18, lines 50-59).

4. Regarding claim 3, Falotico teaches coating the inner and outer surface of the stent with drug/drug combinations wherein the inner surface contains the helical formation (column 12, lines 53-55).

5. Regarding claim 17, Houston discloses a helical formation made from polymer foam [0050].

6. Regarding claim 18, Houston discloses a helical formation made from polyurethane [0039].

7. Regarding claim **19**, Falotico teaches a drug that is bound onto the cellular structure of the polymer through crosslinking wherein the pharmaceutical agents are bonded to the atoms and chains of the polymers of the coatings and films (column 19, lines 65-67).

8. Regarding claim **20**, Falotico teaches therapeutic and pharmaceutical coatings of antiplatelet agents, anticoagulants and fibrinolytic agents (column 10, lines 14, 29-30 and column 18, lines 29-30) wherein the coatings can be layered to control release of different agents placed in different layers (column 18, lines 2-4).

9. Regarding claim **21**, Houston discloses a vascular implant that is a stent, stent graft and a graft [0011] having an insert therein.

10. Regarding claim **22**, Houston discloses a membrane or “sleeve” positioned within the stent that is made of flexible material and attached to the body of the stent [0046].

11. Regarding claim **23**, Houston discloses the sleeve being formed of PTFE material [0046].

12. Regarding claim **25**, the combination of Houston, Falotico and Houston ('645) discloses a drug that is releasably associated with the blood-contacting surface of the stent and helical formation attached thereto wherein an inner surface coating (column 12, lines 53-55) containing therapeutic agents are applied into and onto the stent by way of spraying, spinning or dipping (column 14, lines 29-31) and the drug is released through diffusion dependent on the desired release profile (column 19, lines 29-36).

13. Regarding claim **27**, Houston discloses a helical formation having at least one fin (FIG. 3, element #6 and #7, [0048]).

14. Regarding claim **28**, Houston discloses a fin having the shape of a right-angle triangle in cross-section (FIG. 5, [0048]).

15. Regarding claim **29**, Houston discloses a fin having the shape of an isosceles triangle in cross-section (FIG. 6, [0049]).

16. Regarding claim **30**, Houston discloses a fin having the shape of a bell in cross-section (FIG. 7).

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 23 June 2011 have been fully considered and are persuasive with respect to the helical angle taught by Greenhalgh. A new rejection has been submitted above with respect to the helical angle of the helical formation.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOCELIN TANNER whose telephone number is (571)270-5202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday between 9am and 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on 571-272-4357. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

***If there are any inquiries that are not being addressed by first contacting the Examiner or the Supervisor, you may send an email inquiry to***  
***TC3700\_Workgroup\_D\_Inquiries@uspto.gov.***

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jocelin C. Tanner/  
5/14/2012  
Examiner, Art Unit 3731

/Kathleen Sonnett/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3731